

Application Number 10/696,941
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated November 25, 2005. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 21, 23, 25, 26, 32, 37, 39-41 and 44. Applicant has cancelled claims 5, 8, 24, 27, 38 and 42. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-23, 25, 26, 28-37, 39-41 and 43-46 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9-24, 26, 28-38 and 40-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brochure from 3M™ Optical System Div. (75-0500-5195-4 (2002)) ("3M Brochure) in view of Odgido Haruo (JP9157600) ("Haruo"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to the claims as amended. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include all the features of claim 5, now cancelled. Claim 1 now recites a clasp including a *first member* to adhere to a housing of a display and a *second member* to hold a second side of a display screen filter adjacent the housing without adhering to the display screen filter, wherein the second member is attached to the first member. In a similar manner, Applicant has amended independent claims 21 and 32 to include all the features of claims 24 and 38, respectively, now cancelled.

Notwithstanding the claim amendments discussed above, Applicant does not acquiesce to any of the Examiner's rejections or characterizations of the prior art. All the amendments discussed above are being submitted solely in the interest of advancing the current application to immediate issuance. For at least the reasons advanced previously on the record, Applicant maintains that the applied references do not disclose or suggest an adhesive hinge to adhere to a housing of a display screen and a first side of a display screen filter such that the first side of the display screen filter is attached to the housing in a hinged manner, and a clasp to adhere to the housing and hold a second side of the display screen filter adjacent the housing without adhering to the display screen filter. Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to pursue one or more of the previous claims in one or more continuation applications.

Application Number 10/696,941

Responsive to Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner correctly acknowledged that the 3M Brochure reference fails to teach an adhesive hinge being adhered to the housing and a first side of the display screen filter, and asserted that Haruo teaches an adhesive hinge tape for firmly jointing two objects together. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of 3M Brochure with the adhesive hinge tape taught by Haruo for movable attachment to the display screen and easy access to the display screen surface for cleaning.

However, the Examiner failed to consider the clasp including a *first member* that adheres to the housing and a *second member* attached to the first member that holds the display screen filter adjacent the housing, as recited by Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 21 and 32. Instead, the Examiner merely stated that the features of claims 5, 24 and 38, now cancelled, were rejected without providing any basis for the rejection. Regardless, 3M Brochure and Haruo, either singularly or in combination, do not teach or suggest a clasp having a first member and a second member attached to the first member.

The 3M Brochure reference discloses adhesive tabs that comprise single members including adhesive on either both sides of the tab or on only one side of the adhesive tab to either adhere or hold a display screen filter adjacent a housing of a display. 3M Brochure provides no suggestion of a clasp created by attaching a first member and a second member together. The Haruo reference does not describe a clasp of any construction to hold a display screen filter adjacent a housing of a display. In fact, Haruo fails to even mention a display or a display screen filter.

In addition, if the adhesive tape described in Haruo were included in the display screen filter attachment system described in 3M Brochure, it would not result in Applicant's invention as claimed. Including an adhesive tape with the attachment techniques described by 3M Brochure would merely create an additional technique for attaching a display screen filter to a housing of a display screen. For example, a display screen filter could be attached within the adhesive tape taught by Haruo, the double-sided adhesive tabs taught by 3M Brochure, or the single-sided adhesive tabs taught by 3M Brochure. However, the combined teachings of Haruo and 3M Brochure do not teach a clasp that includes a first member that adheres to a housing of a display and a second member attached to the first member that holds a display screen filter

Application Number 10/696,941
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005

adjacent the housing of the display without adhering to the display screen filter, as required by Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 21 and 32.

Applicant has also amended independent claim 41 to include all the features of claim 42, now cancelled. Claim 41 now recites a housing of a display screen that includes a *bezel* and an adhesive hinge formed with a crease substantially along a major axis of the adhesive hinge that corresponds to the *bezel* of the housing. Furthermore, dependent claims 15 and 34 recite the adhesive hinge including a crease substantially along the major axis of the adhesive hinge corresponds to a *bezel* of the housing. Again, the Examiner failed to consider the housing of the display screen including a bezel and the adhesive hinge including a crease that corresponds to the bezel of the housing, as recited by Applicant's amended independent claim 41. Instead, the Examiner merely stated that the features of claims 15, 34 and now cancelled claim 42 were rejected without providing any basis for the rejection.

Regardless, neither 3M Brochure nor Haruo describe a housing of a display screen that includes a bezel. More importantly, 3M Brochure and Haruo, either singularly or in combination, also fail to describe an adhesive hinge that includes a crease that corresponds to a bezel of a housing such that the adhesive hinge may adhere a display screen filter adjacent the housing of a display screen along the bezel.

In a similar manner, the cited references fail to disclose the features required by Applicant's dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28-31, 33-37, 39, 40 and 43-44. For example, claims 3, 22 and 36 recite that the clasp removably holds the display screen filter adjacent the housing such that the display screen filter can be removed from the clasp and moved in an arc about the adhesive hinge. As described above, neither 3M Brochure nor Haruo, either singularly or in combination, disclose an adhesive hinge adhered to a housing of a display screen and a display screen filter to attach the display screen filter to the housing in a hinged manner. Furthermore, the cited references fail to describe the display screen filter capable of being removed from a clasp and moved in an arc about the adhesive hinge.

As another example, claims 7, 26 and 40 recite that the clasp comprises a *memory material* that distorts from an original shape to release the display screen filter and returns to the original shape to hold the display screen filter adjacent the housing. The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select a memory material for

Application Number 10/696,941
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005

the clasps and a metal or a plastic for the rigid substrate of the adhesive hinge. The Examiner further stated that it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use.

Both 3M Brochure and Haruo lack any teaching that would have suggested forming a *second member* of a clasp from a memory material to hold a display screen filter adjacent a housing of a display screen, as recited by Applicant's amended claims 7, 26 and 40. Furthermore, both 3M Brochure and Haruo, either singularly or in combination, fail to describe a system that includes an adhesive hinge to adhere to a display screen filter and a housing of a display screen to attach the display screen filter to the display screen in a hinged manner, and a clasp including a *first member* to adhere to a housing of a display and a *second member* to hold a second side of a display screen filter adjacent the housing without adhering to the display screen filter, as recited by Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 21 and 32 from which claims 7, 26 and 40 depend.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for non-patentability of Applicant's claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-23, 25, 26, 28-37, 39-41 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 45-46 are allowable in their present form, and objected to claims 6, 8, 25, 27 and 39 as including subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For at least the reasons given above, Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 21, 32 and 41 are in condition for allowance. Consequently, dependent claims 6, 25 and 39 are also in condition for allowance. Applicant has cancelled claims 8 and 27.

Application Number 10/696,941
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed agent to discuss this application.

Date:

January 25, 2006

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.

8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105

St. Paul, Minnesota 55125

Telephone: 651.735.1100

Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:



Name: Darcy L. Grunwald

Reg. No.: 56,902